

**BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS****REGULAR MEETING****Monday, November 13, 2000**

Present: June Bailey, James Johnston, Joe McLeland, M.S. Mitchell, Trix Niernberger, Leon Robinson, and William Sanders

Also Present: Joe Johnson and Ken Arnold – Shaefer, Johnson, Cox and Frey Associates PA; Joe Hoover – Wichita Public Schools; Dale Miller, Jamsheed Mehta, Tonia Fairbanks, Daniel Nguyen, Alan Morrison and Bhupendra Patel - Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Department; and Doug Kupper and Maryann Crockett (staff)

President Mitchell called the meeting to order at approximately 3:30 p.m. The minutes of the Regular Meetings of September 11 and October 16, 2000, were reviewed and approved.

1. **Discussion of Wichita Public School Bond Issue and Related Property Issues.** Joe Hoover, Wichita Public Schools, began the presentation by distributing a pamphlet on the Bond Issue Plan. He briefly reviewed the history of the bond issue stating that development of the master plan and bond issue plan for public schools was accomplished through intensive community involvement and public input with over 2,000 individuals serving on committees and sub-committees. He said the committees developed educational specifications such as classroom sizes, school sizes, etc. Evaluation teams then assessed each facility, comparing the specifications and developing a list of needs for each school. He said priorities were established and a master plan and bond issue plan were approved by the School Board and subsequently voted on by the public.

Hoover said the district was interested in discussing land issues and ways the District and City could partner to benefit both organizations. He introduced Ken Arnold from Shaefer, Johnson, Cox and Frey Associates PA, who provided a map of Linwood School. Arnold said they would like to discuss Linwood School, Henry Park and Linwood Park. He reviewed a videotape of the specific sites. He commented that Linwood School, adjacent to Henry Park, was located on a 2.1-acre site and was built in 1910. He said the school was scheduled to be rebuilt under the bond issue plan. He said several options being discussed included rebuilding on the current site, which would require a two to three story structure. He said ideally school designs were single story, particularly from an accessibility standpoint. He said another option would be to build on the Henry Park site, just north of the current structure. He said Henry Park consists of approximately 2 acres. He added that the District would be willing to leave the multi-purpose room on the Linwood School to be turned into a community center and develop the rest of the site as a park to replace Henry Park.

Arnold reviewed the videotape of the North Linwood Park site, which consists of approximately 14 acres, including the shelter, 600 seat outdoor amphitheater, restroom facilities, various playground equipment and mature trees. He said the proposal was to build a school on the North Linwood Park site, using approximately 3.5 acres, and share the

playground equipment and other park facilities. He said the school would include a multi-purpose room that community groups could use during the evening, when school was not in session. He stated that the site was ideally located and mentioned the footbridge that connected to residences on the east side of the canal route. He commented that the District was also discussing busing issues and the impact on the park and surrounding neighborhood. He concluded by reviewing the videotape of the new Seltzer School located on east Lincoln, which he commented would be similar in size and design to what was being proposed at Linwood Park.

Arnold requested the opportunity to discuss the two proposals further in addition to the possibility of swapping other school sites that may become available over the next five years of the bond plan with the City, County and other agencies.

Director Kupper asked about the ten-year growth potential for Linwood Elementary. Arnold said growth was projected and that the site may need to be added to or expanded sometime in the future. Director Kupper clarified that the District was requesting 3.5 acres at Linwood Park, but that there was potential for expansion of the school in the future. Johnson responded that future school expansion could be accommodated on the 3.5 acres.

Arnold said they would like to meet with neighborhood groups in the future but wanted to visit with the Park Board first. He said other issues that needed to be researched were land titles and whether there were any restrictive covenants and how the use of Federal Land and Water Conservation Funds to develop Linwood Park impacted the proposal.

There was brief discussion concerning District policies on multi-purpose room rentals and restrictions on accessibility. Hoover indicated those could be negotiated. Mitchell indicated that the Board would take the District's proposals under consideration and added that the Board was interested in making the maximum use of public land. Niernberger requested that the Board be invited to any neighborhood meetings. *[See continuation of discussion under Off Agenda Items.]*

2. **Discussion of Rezoning of Property Adjacent to Evergreen Park.** Dale Miller, Wichita-Sedgwick Metropolitan Area Planning Department, referred board members to the staff report and map of the site. He said the request was for a conditional use to allow additional parking for a restaurant. He said part of the area was currently zoned "B" Multi-Family, with the surrounding site zoned "LC" Limited-Commercial. He said under current regulations "B" zoning cannot be used for parking or other uses that require "LC" zoning. He said the building was formerly a bowling alley and that it was being converted into a drinking establishment restaurant (DER), which meant that they would serve more food and beverages than they would alcohol. He said the Police Department would be responsible for verifying compliance with the regulation and if the applicant was found to be in non-compliance, they would be required to get another conditional use under the category drinking establishment or tavern because the building was located within 200 feet of a park, school or church. He said approximately 366 parking spaces were required for a building that size. He said possibly 231 spaces could be provided, which included 158 spaces in the "B" area or conditional use request. He said in order to use the entire building the applicant will need to find additional parking or make a request to the Board of Zoning Appeals and get a variance to get the parking requirement reduced.

Miller stated that the Planning Commission recommended denial on November 9; however, he has spoken to the applicant's agent who indicated they will appeal that decision. He said the matter should go before the City Council sometime in December and if Council approves the application, staff is recommending eleven conditions as follows: (1) ancillary parking area be developed in conformance with requirements; (2) that a DER license be obtained, in addition to other restrictions on use of the building space; (3) parking cannot be used in association with service of any alcoholic beverages during regular school hours; (4) on-site security both inside and outside the building; (5) the square footage of the building that can be used is regulated by how much parking can be provided; (6) provide landscaping; (7) compliance with lighting standards; (8) compliance with signage standards; (9) compliance with noise standard requirements; (10) develop site in conformance with the approved site plan; and (11) violation of any of the conditions will render the Conditional Use Permit null and void.

In response to Bailey's question, Miller reported that the District Advisory Board (DAB) had recommended denial of the application. Niernberger asked about input from neighborhood groups. Bailey indicated the neighborhood associations expressed their opposition of the application to the DAB. Bailey added that the Principal of Cloud Elementary School, who was extremely concerned about the proposed building use, had contacted her. Bailey also mentioned the impact on future development of the former Arts and Crafts Building.

Miller briefly explained the protest procedure and stated that if 20% of the property owners within the notice area filed a protest to the application, it would require a six out of seven vote of the Council to approve the application instead of a simple majority.

There was brief discussion concerning consumption of alcoholic beverages and cereal malt beverages on park property.

**On motion by Bailey, second by Johnston, IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY VOTED to recommend denial of the rezoning request.**

3. **Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) Enhancement Program** Jamsheed Mehta, Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Department reviewed the item. He referred board members to a map of the current Wichita-Sedgwick County bike path system, which included completed paths and paths that have been funded, but may not be completed yet. He said last year the City submitted approximately fourteen projects totaling over \$7 million. He said only one project was approved which was a path on the east bank of the Big Arkansas River from 2<sup>nd</sup> Street North to Central connecting with Sim Park and a small portion on the west bank connecting Exploration Place North to Seneca. He said the City would match the \$560,000 grant through the City's riverbank improvement project.

Mehta said staff developed a different strategy for the 2003 Program and that the City would not be resubmitting projects that have been turned down two or more times. He briefly reviewed several projects that fell under this category, including the two miles on 21<sup>st</sup> St. between Ridge and Maize Roads, which was part of the path system to Cheney Lake. He commented that the State was more interested in paths that contributed to the overall transportation system. In addition, he added that projects needed to be "stand alone" and not depend on other projects to be completed. He said, therefore, the City could not submit

projects that link to other projects. He said one strategy was to combine two or more projects into one.

Mehta reviewed the projects the City was submitting for the 2003 Program, as follows: Little Arkansas North Riverside Path (13<sup>th</sup>/Ferrell to 21<sup>st</sup>/Amidon); I-135/Gypsum Creek Shared Use Path (Stafford-Wassall-George Washington Blvd.); and I-135/Chisholm Drainageway Shared Roadway and Path (McAdams Park to Grove Park). He added that staff has also been negotiating with KDOT to include path design as part of the KDOT improvement project of the I-135 interchange at 21<sup>st</sup> St.

Mehta stated that monies had been set aside in the current Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to provide the City's 50% match if any of the projects were approved by KDOT. He added that currently there was no City program to provide for a bike path system. He suggested that the Board might want to consider that when reviewing the CIP budget. In response to a question from Mitchell, Mehta suggested that a budget of between \$1/2 to \$1 million each year should be sufficient to start a City bike path program. Mehta concluded by requesting a letter of endorsement from the Board to be included in the KDOT application.

Bailey inquired about the status of a possible connection from East Wichita to West Wichita. Mehta said other than sidewalks there may be a possibility of rail banking if and when the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad is abandoned. Bailey also mentioned the railroad track in the Delano neighborhood.

**On motion by Bailey, second by McLeland, IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY VOTED that staff draft a letter of endorsement for 2003 KDOT Program for the President's signature.**

#### **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

- Article dated 10/29/00 from the Kansas City Star, re: "Sprint to surround headquarters with prairie grass, wildflowers". There was brief discussion concerning cultivation, care and maintenance of wildflowers, and other native plants and grasses.
- 2001 Meeting Schedule.

#### **OFF AGENDA ITEMS**

**On motion by Mitchell, second by Bailey, IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY VOTED that the rules be set aside and that an item be taken up off the agenda concerning the 2001 meeting schedule.**

- Mitchell requested that the February 12, 2001, meeting date be deferred until February 19 due to a scheduling conflict of his. *[The February meeting was subsequently rescheduled to February 5, 2001, due to the President's Day Holiday on February 19.]* It was also voted to reschedule the November meeting to November 5, due to the Veteran's Day Holiday on November 12.

**On motion by McLeland, second by Bailey, IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY VOTED that the schedule be revised.**

- **Continuation of Discussion on Item #1 - Wichita Public School Bond Issue and Related Property Issues.** Requested by Bailey. Bailey stated that she was on both the Bond Issue Steering Committee and “Watch Dog” Committee and that she felt the School District was attempting to get the City and other agencies to work with them. She said this may be an opportunity for the City to acquire the Greiffenstein and Martin School sites. She also asked board members to consider sites in their Districts for possible school locations. Director Kupper reminded the Board that the District was also negotiating with the City and cautioned board members to proceed carefully and not make any commitments. He said any Board motion would be in the way of a recommendation to City management. There was brief discussion concerning possible land trade offs and recreational programming.

Mitchell gave a brief background relaying that there had been previous discussions with the School District regarding the possibility of partnering with the Park and Recreation Department on facility use and possible land trade offs prior to the bond issue program. He said those discussions were suspended pending the outcome of the bond issue. It was the general consensus of the Board that Director Kupper should be the point of contact for any further discussions with the School District.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

- Mitchell acknowledged Lucy Burtnett’s presence and requested a status report on the Riverside Park System Master Plan. Director Kupper said public meetings would be held once a majority of the design was completed. There was mention of the Park Alliance possibly assisting with fund raising for the project.
- McLeland inquired about the Board’s involvement in golf courses and management contracts. Director Kupper reported that he had reviewed and revised the proposal that had been submitted to the City Council. He said he would provide board members a copy of the proposal.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at approximately 5:00 p.m.

---

M.S. Mitchell, President

ATTEST:

---

Maryann Crockett, Clerk